1) Basics

- 1.1) Introduction to standard MPT models
- 1.2) Examples
- 1.3) Model development
- 1.4) Formal model structure
- 1.5) Identifiability
- 1.6) Parameter estimation
- 1.7) Model assessment
- 1.8) Selected literature

1.4) Formal model structure

- Multinomial models
- Parameterized multinomial models
- Multinomial processing tree (MPT) models
- Processing-tree representation of MPT models

Multinomial Models

a) One condition (simple multinomial model)

- One variable with J categories and sample frequencies $n_1, n_2, ..., n_j, ..., n_J$.
- $\boldsymbol{\pi} = (p_1, p_2, ..., p_J)$ is the vector of category probabilities.
- Given independent sampling, the sample frequencies follow a multinomial distribution:

$$p_{N,\pi}(n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_J) = \frac{N}{n_1! n_2! \ldots n_J!} p_1^{n_1} p_2^{n_2} \ldots p_J^{n_J}$$

b) Several conditions (joint multinomial model)

- In each condition k ($k = 1, ..., K$), one categorical variable with $J(k)$ categories is observed.
- For each of the K conditions a simple multinomial model holds.
- Given independence between conditions, the overall probability of the sample frequencies across conditions is

$$p = \prod_{k=1}^{K} p_{N(k),\boldsymbol{\pi}(k)}(n_{1(k)}, n_{2(k)}, ..., n_{J(k)})$$

Parameterized Multinomial Models

- The category probabilities p_1, p_2 etc. are rewritten as functions of "latent parameters" $\theta_1, \theta_2, ..., \theta_S$
- Thus, in case of a simple multinomial model we have
  - $p_1 = f_1(\theta_1, \theta_2, ..., \theta_S)$
  - $p_2 = f_2(\theta_1, \theta_2, ..., \theta_S)$
  - ....
  - $p_J = f_J(\theta_1, \theta_2, ..., \theta_S)$
- These equations are called model equations.
- The set of possibles values of S latent parameters is called "parameter space" Ω of the model.

Multinomial Processing Tree (MPT) Models

- MPT models form a subclass of parameterized multinomial models.
- Additional assumptions:

1) Each θ_s is in [0, 1]

Multinomial Processing Tree (MPT) Models

- MPT models form a subclass of parameterized multinomial models.
- Additional assumptions:

1) Each θ_s is in [0, 1]

2) Structure of the model equations (Hu & Batchelder, 1994):

$$p_j = \sum_{i=1}^{I(j)} c_{ij} \prod_{s=1}^{S} \theta_s^{a_{ijs}} \cdot (1-\theta_s)^{b_{ijs}}, \qquad \sum_{j=1}^{J} p_j = 1, \qquad \theta_s \in [0, 1]$$

where s: Parameter index

j: Category index

i: *B*ranch index

c_{ij}: positive real number

a_{ijs}, b_{ijs}: nonnegative integer number (often 0 or 1)

Binary probabilistic event trees can always be translated in MPT-model equations:



... as an aside ...

- Although any binary processing tree diagram uniquely determines a system of MPT model equations ...
- ... it is not true that any system of MPT model equations uniquely determines a specific processing tree diagram.
- Counter examples:
  - Level switching in independence models
  - Category switching given identical branch probabilities


Start
θ1
1-θ1
Z1
Z2
θ2
1-θ2
θ3
1-θ3
Z1.1
Z2.1
Z1.2
Z2.2
θ4
1-θ4
θ5
1-θ5
θ6
1-θ6
θ7
1-θ7
Cj1
Cj2
Cj3
Cj4
Cj5
Cj6
Cj7
Cj8

Another counter example is this MPT model:

$$p_1(\theta) = \theta^3$$
$$p_2(\theta) = \theta \cdot (1-\theta)$$
$$p_3(\theta) = \theta \cdot (1-\theta)$$
$$p_4(\theta) = \theta \cdot (1-\theta)$$
$$p_5(\theta) = (1-\theta)^3$$

Two different processing trees compatible with the model on the previous slide:



1.5) Identifiability

Any MPT model equation system

$$p_j = \sum_{i=1}^{I(j)} c_{ij} \prod_{s=1}^{S} \theta_s^{a_{ijs}} \cdot (1-\theta_s)^{b_{ijs}}, \qquad \sum_{j=1}^{J} p_j = 1, \qquad \theta_s \in [0, 1]$$

where s: Parameter index

j: Category index

i: Branch index

c_{ij}: positive real number

a_{ijs}, b_{ijs}: nonnegative integer number (often 0 or 1)

defines a mapping f: $\Omega \rightarrow$ P

Parameter Space and Data Space

Ω is called „Parameter Space“:

= Set of all possible parameter vectors

P is called „Data Space“ (more precisely: space of category probabilities)

= Set of all possible category probability vectors

Definition (global identifiability):

A MPT model is globally identified if f is one-to-one.

Definition (local identifiability):

A MPT model is locally identified if f is one-to-one in the neighborhood of θ_0 in Ω.

One-High-Threshold recognition model

(Blackwell, 1953)



r: probability of recognition

g: probability of guessing old given recognition

Example 1 (nonidentifiability)



- One-high-Threshold-Modell limited to old items:
  - p("alt" | old item) = $r + (1\text{-}r) \cdot g$
- Model is not identified.

One-High-Threshold recognition model

(Blackwell, 1953)



r: probability of recognition

g: probability of guessing old given recognition

Example 2 (identifiability)



- One-high-Threshold-Model (old and new items)
  - p(“alt” | old item) $= r + (1-r) \cdot g$
  - p(„alt“ | new item) $= g$
- Model ist globally identified.

Two important theorems:

- „*Observable branches*“:

  A model is always globally identified if each of its branches terminates in a unique empirical category (Hu & Batchelder, 1994).

Two important theorems:

- „*Observable branches*“:

  A model is always globally identified if each of its branches results in a new empirical category (Hu & Batchelder, 1994).

- „*No more parameters than degrees of freedom in the data*“:

  A necessary but not sufficient condition of identifiability is

$$S \leq \sum_{k=1}^{K} (J(k) - 1).$$

Jacobian Matrix

- Jacobian: Matrix of the 1st partial derivates of the model equations with respect to parameters θ_s , $s = 1, \ldots S$.
- r: maximum rank of the Jacobian across Ω
- If $r < S$, then the model is neither locally nor globally identified.
- If $r = S$, then the model is locally identified (but not necessarily globally).

Remedies for nonidentifiable models

- Parameter constraints
  - Parameter fixations ($\theta_s = c$, with c = constant)
  - Equality constraints ($\theta_s = \theta_{s'}$)
- Increase the number of empirical categories
  - Additional conditions, no (or few) additional parameters
  - Selective manipulations of parameters

1.6) Parameter Estimation

Find a parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\theta_1, ..., \theta_s, ..., \theta_S), \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Omega$, such that the distance between the sample frequencies $n_1, n_2, ..., n_J$ and the expected category frequencies under the model, $N \cdot p_1(\boldsymbol{\theta}), N \cdot p_2(\boldsymbol{\theta}), ..., N \cdot p_J(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, becomes a minimum.

1.6) Parameter Estimation

Find a parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\theta_1, ..., \theta_s, ..., \theta_S), \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Omega$, such that the distance between the sample frequencies $n_1, n_2, ..., n_J$ and the expected category frequencies under the model, $N \cdot p_1(\boldsymbol{\theta}), N \cdot p_2(\boldsymbol{\theta}), ..., N \cdot p_J(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, becomes a minimum.

Which distance measure?

1.6) Parameter Estimation

Find a parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\theta_1, ..., \theta_s, ..., \theta_S), \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Omega$, such that the distance between the sample frequencies $n_1, n_2, ..., n_J$ and the expected category frequencies under the model, $N \cdot p_1(\boldsymbol{\theta}), N \cdot p_2(\boldsymbol{\theta}), ..., N \cdot p_J(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, becomes a minimum.

Which distance measure?

The likelihood ratio statistic G^2 and Pearson's χ^2 are used most often:

$$G^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = 2\sum_{j=1}^{J} n_j \ln\left(\frac{n_j}{N \cdot p_j(\boldsymbol{\theta})}\right) \qquad \chi^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{j=1}^{J} \frac{[n_j - N \cdot p_j(\boldsymbol{\theta})]^2}{N \cdot p_j(\boldsymbol{\theta})}$$

Both distance measures are special cases of the Power-Divergence-family (PD_λ-Statistics) (Read & Cressie, 1988):

$$s_\lambda = \frac{2}{\lambda(\lambda+1)} \sum_{k=1}^{k} \sum_{i=1}^{J(k)} n_{j(k)} \cdot \left[\left(\frac{n_{j(k)}}{e_{j(k)}} \right)^\lambda - 1 \right]$$

Note that:

Pearson-χ^2 $= S_{\lambda=1}$
Likelihood-ratio-G^2 $= \lim_{\lambda \to 0} S_\lambda$.

What is the best estimation method?

- All S_λ-estimates have the same asymptotic properties:
  - Consistent, efficient, asympotically unbiased
  - (multivariate) normal sampling distributions
- Choosing λ=0 (i.e., minimizing G^2) provides Maximum Likelihood (ML) estimates:
  - Sample frequencies have highest likelihood
  - Standard method in typical applications
- All S_λ-estimates are easily implemented using the robust Expectation-Maximization (EM) estimation algorithm.

Expectation-Maximization-(EM) Algorithm

- 1) Choose a start vector θ_i.
- 2) **E**(xpectation)-Step:
  - Estimate the expected frequencies of the branches given θ_i and the observed category frequencies $n_{j(k)}$
- 3) **M**(aximization)-Step:
  - Let i = i + 1
  - Compute new S_λ estimates θ_i given the expected frequencies from step 2)
- 4) Convergence ?
  - If Abs(θ_i- θ_{i-1}) > Criterion go back to step 2).
- 5) Otherwise accept θ_i as final parameter estimates $\hat{\theta}$

Graphical Illustration of the EM-Algorithm applied to *c* and *r* in storage-retrieval model:



EM paths in Ω for $\lambda = 0$, given five different starting values (simulated data).



Likelihood (y-axis) as a function of *c* und *r* given the same data.

Bottom line

- Use G^2-minimization (= likelihood maximization) as the default estimation method.
- Repeat the estimation process several times using random start values to make sure that you really found a global maximum of the likelihood function.

1.7) Model assessment



How to test H_0: $\pi \in f(\Omega)$?

Options:

$$\text{Pearson}\,\chi^2 = \sum_{k=1}^{K}\sum_{j=1}^{J(k)} (n_{j(k)} - e_{j(k)})^2 / e_{j(k)},$$

or

$$\text{Likelihood-ratio-}G^2 = 2 \cdot \sum_{k=1}^{K}\sum_{j=1}^{J(k)} n_{j(k)} \cdot ln(n_{j(k)} / e_{j(k)});$$

$$\text{with } e_{j(k)} = p_{j(k)}(\hat{\theta}) \cdot N(k)$$

Both statistics are special cases of Read und Cressies (1988) „Power Divergence“ – Statistics:

$$S_\lambda = \frac{2}{\lambda(\lambda+1)} \sum_{k=1}^{k} \sum_{l=1}^{J(k)} n_{j(k)} * \left[\left(\frac{n_{j(k)}}{e_{j(k)}} \right)^{\lambda} - 1 \right]$$

Again:
Pearson-$\chi^2 = S_{\lambda=1}$
Likelihood-ratio-$G^2 = \lim_{\lambda \to 0} S_\lambda$.

All S_λ – Statistics are asymptotically (i.e., for $N \to$ oo) chi-square distributed under H_0 (i.e., the model holds) with

$$df = \sum_{k=1}^{K} (J(k) - 1) - S.$$

What is the best goodness-of-fit statistic?

- In case of very small sample sizes, $S_{\lambda=2/3}$ outperforms other S_λ-statistics (such as $G^2 = S_{\lambda=0}$) in terms of accuracy of Chi-square approximation (cf. Read & Cressie, 1988).
- However, very small samples are typically less of a problem in MPT model applications (unless models are tested for single participants).
- Given the fact that G^2 is a by-product of ML-parameter estimation, G^2 can be recommended for moderate to large sample sizes.
- However, you cannot choose G^2 in case of samples with zero cells.
- Remedies: 1) Ignore 0 cells, 2) add constant ε to all counts

Model comparisons

- Assume that model B (M_B) holds for your data: $G^2(M_B)$ is not significant.
- Then often M_B is compared to an alternative model A (M_A) that is a special case of M_B.
- M_A is obtained by applying a parameter restriction to M_B, e.g., an equality constraint or a parameter fixation.
- How to decide whether M_A fits the data worse than M_B?

Model M_A as a special case of M_B:

Illustration of model-specific mapping of Ω_A and Ω_B in P.



This is called a „hierarchical model family“.

Model comparisons in hierarchical model families

- If both M_A and M_B hold then

  G^2_A is chi-square distributed with df_A

  G^2_B is chi-square distributed with df_B

  $\Delta G^2_{A-B} := G^2_A - G^2_B$ is chi-square distributed with $df_{A-B} = df_A - df_B$.
- In other words, G^2 is additive (irrespective of *N*):

  $G^2_A = G^2_B + \Delta G^2_{A-B}$
- This additivity property does not hold for other PD_λ-stats.
- Using ΔG^2_{A-B}, it is easy to compare different models in a hierarchical model family using chi-square tests
- This is perhaps the strongest argument for relying on G^2 for purposes of model fitting and testing.

Model comparisons in nonhierarchical model families

- Unfortunately, $\Delta G^2_{A\text{-}B} := G^2_A - G^2_B$ cannot be used in nonhierarchical model families.
- How to proceed then?

Information-theoretic measures of goodness-of-fit

- Akaike Information Criterion (AIC):
  - $AIC(M_0) = -2 \cdot \ln(L(\boldsymbol{\theta};\mathbf{y})) + 2 \cdot S$
  - $\Delta AIC(M_0) = AIC(M_0) - AIC(sat.) = G^2(M_0) - 2 \cdot df(M_0)$
- Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC):
  - $BIC(M_0) = -2 \cdot \ln(L(\boldsymbol{\theta};\mathbf{y})) + S \cdot \ln(N)$
  - $\Delta BIC(M_0) = BIC(M_0) - BIC(sat.) = G^2(M_0) - df(M_0) \cdot \ln(N)$
- Rule:
  - Choose the model with the smaller AIC / BIC
- Recommendation:
  - Fit is excellent if ΔAIC or $\Delta BIC < 0$.

1.8) Selected literature

- Batchelder, W. H., & Riefer, D. M. (1999). Theoretical and empirical review of multinomial process tree modeling. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review, 6*, 57-86.
- Erdfelder, E., Auer, T.-S., Hilbig, B. E., Aßfalg, A., Moshagen, M., & Nadarevic, L. (2009). Multinomial processing tree models: A review of the literature. *Zeitschrift für Psychologie-Journal of Psychology, 217*, 108-124.
- Hu, X., & Batchelder, W. H. (1994). The statistical analysis of general processing tree models with the EM algorithm. *Psychometrika, 59*, 21-47.
- *Hu, X. (1999). Multinomial processing tree models: An implementation. Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers, 31, 689-695.*
- Kuhlmann, B., Erdfelder, E.. & Moshagen, M. (2019). Testing interactions in multinomial processing tree models. *Frontiers in Psychology, 10*, 2364

- Moshagen, M. (2010). multiTree: A computer program for the analysis of multinomial processing tree models. *Behavior Research Methods, 42*, 42-54.
- Klauer, K.C. (2006). Hierarchical multinomial processing tree models: A latent-class approach. *Psychometrika*, *71*, 7–31.
- Riefer, D. M., & Batchelder, W. H. (1988). Multinomial modeling and the measurement of cognitive processes. *Psychological Review, 95*, 318-339.
- Rothkegel, R. (1999). AppleTree: A multinomial processing tree modeling program for Macintosh computers. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers, 31, 696-700.*
- Singmann, H., & Kellen, D. (2013). MPTinR: Analysis of multinomial processing tree models in R. *Behavior Research Methods*, *45*, 560–575.
- Stahl, C. & Klauer, K.C. (2007). HMMTree: A computer program for latent-class hierarchical multinomial processing-tree models. *Behavior Research Methods.*